

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claims 1-19, 22-33, 42-74, and 89-102 were pending in the application and subject to examination, of which Claims 1, 42, 89, 93, and 97 are independent claims. By this Amendment, Claims 1, 42, 89, 93, and 97 have been amended and Claims 103-106 have been newly added. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at, for example, page 82, lines 2-15, and page 83, lines 12-29. No new matter has been introduced.

In the Office Action mailed April 29, 2008, Claims 1, 3-19, 22-24, 27-29, 33, 42-65, 68-70, 74, and 88-97 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Published Application No. 2005/0144133 to Hoffman ("Hoffman") in view of US Patent No. 6,886,000 to Aggarwal et al. ("Aggarwal") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,334,109 to Kanevsky et al. ("Kanevsky"). Claims 25, 26, 66, and 66 were rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,016,484 to Williams et al. ("Williams"). Claims 30-32 and 71-73 were rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky, and further in view of US Patent No. 5,613,109 to Yamauchi ("Yamauchi"). Claims 98-102 were rejection as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoffman/Aggarwal/Kanevsky and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,918,213 to Bernard et al. ("Bernard"). It is noted that Claims 1, 42, 89, 93, and 97 have been amended. To the extent that the grounds for rejection are still applicable to the currently pending claims, they are respectfully traversed.

With regards to the rejection of independent Claim 1, now amended, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Hoffman, Aggarwal, and Kanevsky, when taken singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the combination of features of generating a table for the product or service for each user to record statistical information concerning purchases and requests for information concerning particular products and services, wherein the statistical information is used for selecting particular advertisements for display to the user; providing an electronic catalog identifying products and services to be accessed by the user, wherein the electronic catalog includes a default catalog and a customer catalog, the customer catalog is determined based upon identification of products and services previously purchased or for which information was requested, and displaying the default catalog to the user when there is no record of identification of products and services, as recited in Claim 1, as amended. The above similar features are also included in amended Claims 42, 89, 93, and 97.

The Applicants submit that Hoffman does not disclose or suggest generating a table for the product or service for each user to record statistical information concerning purchases and requests for information concerning particular products and services. The Office Action alleged that paragraphs [0168]-[0174] and [00192] of Hoffman teaches storing data for each user to record statistical information and using such data to determine which product images to insert. Applicants respectfully disagree.

As specifically defined in paragraph [0173], pattern data 54 does not include statistical information concerning purchases and requests for information concerning particular products and services, as recited in amended Claims 1, and similarly in amended Claims 42, 89, 93, and 97. In Kanevsky, as described in col. 10, lines 6-22,

the database 356 stores data concerning a plurality of users, not for purchases and requests for information for each user. Aggarwal mentions nothing about a table. Furthermore, none of the cited art teaches or suggests providing an electronic catalog.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art. As claim 1 is allowable, Applicants submit that claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-12, 15-19, 22, 24-27, 30-33, 103, and 105 which depend from allowable amended Claim 1, are likewise allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for amended Claim 1.

Amended independent Claims 42, 89, 93, and 97 include similar features of amended Claim 1, as described above. For similar reasons as for amended Claim 1, the Applicants submit that amended Claims 42, 89, 93, and 97 are likewise allowable.

As amended Claims 42, 89, 93 and 97 are allowable, Applicants submit that Claims 43-74, 90-92, 95-96, 104, and 106 which depend from allowable amended Claims 42, 89, 93, and 97, are likewise allowable for at least the reasons set forth above for amended Claims 42, 89, 93, and 97.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300 with reference to docket number 026880-00011.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox PLLC



Wan-Ching Montfort
Registration No. 56,127

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 715-8492
Facsimile No. (202) 638-4810